arXiv:1108.2018v4 [cs.GT] 10 Feb 2012

Resource Allocation with Costly Participation

Ali Kakhbod
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
October 2010
Email: `akakhbod@umich.edu`

Abstract

In this paper we propose a new revenue maximizing dynamic game for allocating resources to strategic users. We show that for the proposed game there exists a symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium, which is not only unique but also Markov perfect. Furthermore, we fully characterize it and derive the revenue of the network's owner.

I. INTRODUCTION

The design of resource allocation mechanisms which guarantee the delivery of different services and maximize some network-wide performance criterion (e.g. the networks utility to its users) is an important and challenging task. The challenges come from the fact that the network's users may behave strategically (i.e. they may behave selfishly). If information were centralized, the resource allocation problem could be formulated and solved as a mathematical programming problem or as a dynamic programming problem. Since information is not centralized such formulations are not possible. Recently, within the context of communication networks, researchers have investigated decentralized resource allocation problems under the assumption that users behave strategically. Within the context of wired networks, decentralized resource allocation mechanisms have been proposed and analyzed in [1]–[7] and [8]. For a survey on the relationship of mechanism design and decentralized resource allocation in communication networks we refer the reader to [9].

In this paper, we introduce a new approach for allocating resources (e.g. channels) to strategic users which is distinctly different from all the above papers. This method is philosophically similar to a game called War of Attrition ([10]). In game theory, the war of attrition is a model of aggression in which two contestants compete for a resource of value V by persisting while constantly accumulating costs over the time t that the contest lasts. The model was originally formulated by John Maynard Smith [11] in the context of theoretical biology. In Smith's game two animals compete for a prize of common value V. As soon as one player drops out play ends and the prize is given to the other player. The game is in continuous time and there is a constant waiting cost per unit of time. In the two player complete information case, the game has a unique symmetric equilibrium in which players randomize over all possible dropout times according to an exponential distribution with mean $\frac{V}{c}$ where c is the constant waiting cost per unit of time.

In this work, we present a model for allocating a channel to a user among a set of strategic players/users which is philosophically similar to the War of Attrition with this difference that our model is formulated in discrete time. We, further, extend the game so as to include the case with re-entry option for drop out players/users. We, for generality, assume that the value of wining the object decreases for any user as time goes on (we precisely define it in Section II).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II we define and explain the components of our proposed resource allocation game. In Section III we investigate the existence and uniqueness of a symmetric equilibrium of the specified game and characterize its desired properties. In Section IV we consider the game formulated in II with re-entry option for users. In Section V we derive the revenue of the network's owner. We conclude in Section VI.

II. GAME: SET UP *without* RE-ENTRY OPTION

Consider the following dynamic game with complete information, n strategic users (the set of users is denoted by N) and a channel. In each round $t, t \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$, of the game user $i, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, chooses/reports an action from the set of pure strategies $S = \{yes, no\}, s_{i,t} \in S$, and observes his opponents actions, $s_{j,t}, j \neq i$. In each round of the game users submit their messages simultaneously. Value of the channel for each user is initially equal to V and it is common knowledge among the users. When a user plays *no*, the user will be out for the rest of the game (in Section IV we will study the case with re-entry option for users who play *no*). The remaining number of users in round t of the game is denoted by $n(t)$ (the set of remaining users in round t is denoted by $N(t)$). History of the game up to time $t, t \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$, which is common knowledge among the users, is denoted by $h^t = (\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2, \cdots, \boldsymbol{s}_{t-1})$, where $\boldsymbol{s}_k = (s_{1,k}, s_{2,k}, \cdots, s_{n(t),k})$ represents the strategy profile reported by the users in round k of the game. User $i, i \in N(t)$, wins the channel in round t of the game if and only if $s_{i,t} = yes, \;\; s_{j,t} = no, \; j \neq i, \; j \in N(t)$. That is, user i wins the channel in round t of the game if and only if he is the *only* user, among the $n(t)$ users, who plays yes in round t.

We assume playing yes is costly for each user. In detail, when a user plays yes he pays c_{yes} (participation cost) to the network's owner, where $c_{yes} < V$, (c_{yes} is common knowledge among the users). Notice that we assume "participation cost" is the only source of benefit for the network's owner that receives from the users.

Remark 1. *For the sake of generality, we assume the value of wining the channel for each user is decreasing in time and is captured by $V - g(t)$, where $g(t), g(t) \geq 0$, is an increasing function in t, common knowledge among the users and, $\lim_{t\to\infty} g(t) < V - c_{yes}$.*

Assumption 1 (Tie Breaking [10])**.** *We assume if in round t of the game* all *the (current) users play no, then network's owner will ask the users to resubmit their messages.*

By above specifications, we define the utility of user $i, i \in N(t)$, in round t of the game, as follows:

$$\begin{cases} u_{i,t}(h^t|s_{i,t} = yes) = V - g(t) - c_{yes}(\Delta_y^{t-1} + 1) & \text{if } s_{i,t} = yes, s_{j,t} = no, \; j \neq i, \; j \in N(t); \\ u_{i,t}(h^t|s_{i,t} = yes) = -c_{yes}(\Delta_y^{t-1} + 1) & \text{Otherwise;} \\ u_{i,t}(h^t|s_{i,t} = no) = -c_{yes}\Delta_y^{t-1} & \forall \; s_{j,t}, \; s_{j,t} \in \{yes, no\}, j \neq i, j \in N(t). \end{cases}$$

where

$$\Delta_y^{t-1} := \Big|\{k : s_{i,k} = yes, k = 1, 2, \cdots, t-1\}\Big|,$$

where $|A|$ stands for the cardinality of a set A.
To clarify more, in round t of the game, the channel is allocated to a user (a user wins the channel) if and only if he is the only one who plays yes in that round. In other cases no user wins the channel.

Observation 1. *As it is observed from the game specification, the users and information structure are symmetric. Naturally, we are only interested in characterizing symmetric equilibriums of this game.*

III. EQUILIBRIUM: CHARACTERIZATION

In this section we show that there is a *unique* symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium for the game described in Section II. We fully characterize it and show it is *Markov perfect* as well, that is, the strategy of each user in each round t of the game depends only on the number of remaining users ($n(t)$), $g(t)$, and the constants V, c_{yes}.
In the following we explain the notations and concepts we use along the paper.

Notations: Consider a subgame beginning after history h^t. $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)]$ is the expected utility of user $i, i \in N(t)$, in this subgame and, $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}]$ ($\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}]$) is the expected utility of user i in this subgame given that he plays yes (no) in round t. Each user at any time t chooses a strategy which is a map from any history of the game up to time t to $[0, 1]$, a Bernoulli probability over $\{yes, no\}$. Let $p_t(h^t), 0 \leq p_t(h^t) \leq 1,$ be the probability of choosing yes after observing history h^t of the game.

The following theorem is the first main theorem of this paper. This theorem proves the existence and uniqueness of a Symmetric Subgame Perfect Equilibrium (SSPE) of the game specified in Section II. We further fully characterize the SSPE and show it is also Markov perfect.

Theorem 1 (The First Main Theorem)**.** *For the game specified in Section II, there is a symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium (SSPE) which has the following desirable properties:*

- Uniqueness*, i.e., there is only one symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium.*
- Markov perfect*, i.e., users' strategies in each round t of the game depend only on the state of the game in round t.*
- *The SSPE is characterized as follows. In each round $t, t \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$, (after history h^t) of the game, each user $i, i \in N(t)$,* purely *randomizes over $\{yes, no\}$ and chooses to play yes with the following probability*

$$p_t(V, n(t), g(t), c_{yes}) = 1 - \sqrt[n(t)-1]{\frac{c_{yes}}{V - g(t)}}. \tag{1}$$

In the rest of this section we prove this theorem. To prove the theorem, we first prove a set of Lemmas we need them along the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 2. *In any subgame after h^t, the expected utility of each user $i, i \in N(t)$, is upper-bounded by $\frac{V-g(t)-c_{yes}}{n(t)}$.*

Proof: The proof follows by the fact that the average utility of each user $i, i \in N(t)$, in any subgame beginning after h^t is less than $\frac{V-g(t)-c_{yes}}{n(t)}$. ■

Lemma 3. *There exits $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $t, t \in \{1, 2, ...\}$, and any subgame after h^t, $p_t(h^t) > \alpha$.*

Proof: Suppose there is not such α, i.e., for any $\alpha > 0$ there exists h^t such that $p_t(h^t) < \alpha$. Thus (pick α very small), for any $i, i \in N(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] > (1-\alpha)^{n-1}(V - g(t) - c_{yes}) &\overset{(a)}{>} \frac{V - g(t) - c_{yes}}{n(t)} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}].\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

(a) follows since α is very small.

Therefore, it is preferable for each user to always play $\{yes\}$, i.e., $p_t(h^t) = 1$, which is a contradiction. Thus, there exists α such that $p_t(h^t) > \alpha$. ■

In the following lemma we prove an interesting property of the game proposed in Section II. We show in any symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium, after any history

h^t, no matter how users have played up to round t, in round t of the game, *all* the $n(t)$ users must *purely* randomize over $\{yes, no\}$, i.e., $p_t(h^t) \in (0,1)$, $p_t(h^t) \neq 0, 1$.

Lemma 4. *In any symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium of the game,* $\forall t \in \{1, 2, 3....\}$, *and history* h^t *which occurs with positive probability in equilibrium,* $p_t(h^t) \in (0,1)$, *i.e.,* $p_t(h^t) \neq 0, 1$.

Proof: The proof has two parts. First, we show that $p_t(h^t) \neq 0$. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose after some history h^t which occurs with positive probability in equilibrium each user $i, i \in N(t)$, plays no, i.e. $p_t(h^t) = 0$. Then, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] = V - g(t) - c_{yes} \geq \frac{V - g(t) - c_{yes}}{n(t)} \overset{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}],$$

the inequality (a) is correct by Lemma 2.

In the second part of the proof we show that $\forall h^t, t \in \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$, where h^t is the history happened with positive probability in equilibrium, $p_t(h^t) \neq 1$. Notice that so far we have proved $p_t(h^t) \in (0, 1]$.

Again, we proceed by contradiction. Suppose $p_t(h^t) = 1$, i.e., all users play yes. Thus, for any $i, i \in N(t)$, we have the following:

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}] = 0, \tag{3}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] = -c_{yes} + \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)], \tag{4}$$

now, there are two scenarios that can happen at $t+1$:

The first $p_{t+1}(h^{t+1}) \in (0,1)$ and the second $p_{t+1}(h^{t+1}) = 1$, since we proved $p_{t+1}(h^{t+1}) > 0$. We analyze them, separately, in the following.

In the first scenario, since $p_{t+1}(h^{t+1}) \in (0,1)$, thus user $i, i \in N(t)$, should be indifferent between choosing yes and no, that is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)|\{yes\}] = \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)|\{no\}] \\ &= \text{Prob}\Big\{\text{all the } n(t)-1 \text{ users play } no\Big\}\, \mathbb{E}_{i,t+2}[h^{t+2}, n(t)] \\ &= \Big[(1-p_{t+1}(h_{t+1}))^{n(t)-1}\Big]\, \mathbb{E}_{i,t+2}[h^{t+2}, n(t)] \qquad (5)\end{aligned}$$

Equation (5) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t+2}[h^{t+2}, n(t)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)]}{(1-p_{t+1}(h^{t+1}))^{n(t)-1}} > \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)]. \qquad (6)$$

In the second scenario $p_{t+1}(h^{t+1}) = 1$, i.e., user $i, i \in N(t)$, strictly prefers to play yes. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] = \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)|\{yes\}] = -c_{yes} + \mathbb{E}_{i,t+2}[h^{t+2}, n(t)] \\ &\Rightarrow\ \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] < \mathbb{E}_{i,t+2}[h^{t+2}, n(t)]. \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

From the above two scenarios it concludes that $a(k) = \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)]$ is an increasing sequence, i.e. $a(1) < a(2) < a(3)....$
Therefore, monotonicity together with boundedness (due to Lemma 2) of $\{a(k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ should imply the convergence of the sequence. But, in the sequel, we show $\{a(k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not convergent that implies a contradiction and completes the proof of Lemma 4.

To show that $\{a(k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not convergent we only need to show:

$$\exists\epsilon > 0, s.t.\ \forall M \in \mathbb{N},\ \exists k \text{ such that } k \geq M, \text{ and } |a(k) - a(k+1)| > \epsilon.$$

For this matter, we pick ϵ fixed and less than $\min\Big\{c_{yes}, c_{yes}\Big[\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^{n-1}} - 1\Big]\Big\}$ (where α is as it is defined in Lemma 3). Now, suppose that the second scenario happens at $t+k$. Then $|a(k+1) - a(k)| = c_{yes} > \epsilon$ (due to (7)). But, there is another situation that there may exist $M \in \mathbb{N}$ in which for any $k > M$ second scenario does not happen, i.e., for any $k > M$, $p_{t+k}(h^{t+k}) \in (0,1)$. This case can also be considered as follows.

Since, as it is earlier assumed, for any $k > M$, $p_{t+k}(h^{t+k}) \in (0,1)$, and $p_{t+k}(h^{t+k}) > \alpha$ (due to Lemma 3), then by employing (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)] &= (1 - p_{t+k}(h^{t+k}))^{n(t)-1}\mathbb{E}_{i,t+k+1}[h^{t+k+1}, n(t)] \\ &\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k+1}[h^{t+k+1}, n(t)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)]}{(1 - p_{t+k}(h^{t+k}))^{n(t)-1}} \\ &\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k+1}[h^{t+k+1}, n(t)] > \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)]}{[(1-\alpha)^{n(t)-1}]} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$\Rightarrow$

$$\begin{aligned} a(k+1) - a(k) &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k+1}[h^{t+k+1}, n(t)] - \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)] \\ &> \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)]}{(1-\alpha)^{n(t)-1}} - \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)] \\ &> \frac{\mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)]}{(1-\alpha)^{n(t)-1}} - \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n]\left[\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^{n(t)-1}} - 1\right] \\ &\overset{(a)}{\geq} c_{yes}\left[\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^{n(t)-1}} - 1\right] \\ &\geq \min\left\{c_{yes}, c_{yes}\left[\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^{n(t)-1}} - 1\right]\right\} \\ &\geq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where (a) is correct due to the fact that $a(k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is monotone (thus $\mathbb{E}_{i,t+k}[h^{t+k}, n(t)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}, n(t)]$) and (4). The above statement proves $a(k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not convergent. Thus the proof of Lemma 4 is complete. ■

Now, we are equipped enough to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1: Consider a subgame beginning after h^t with $n(t)$ users.

Now, In round t, if user i, $i \in N(t)$, plays yes, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] &= -c_{yes} + (V - g(t))(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{n(t)-1} \binom{n(t)-1}{k} p_t(h^t)^k (1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-k} \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t+1)] \quad (10)\end{aligned}$$

where[1] the first term corresponds to the payment of choosing yes, the second term corresponds to the event that user i wins the channel, i.e. the event in which user i is the only user who plays yes in round t and, the third term corresponds to the expected utility of user i from continuing after history h^t, equivalently, more than one user play yes.

Similarly, if user i, $i \in N(t)$, plays no, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}] &= 0 \times \text{Prob}\Big\{\text{at least one user among } n(t) \text{ users play } yes\Big\} \\ &\quad +\text{Prob}\Big\{\text{all the } n(t) \text{ users play } no\Big\}\ \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] \\ &= (1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1} \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] \quad (12)\end{aligned}$$

where the first term corresponds to the event in which at least one user $j, j \neq i, j \in N(t)$, plays yes, thus, player i will be out for the rest of the game and, the second term corresponds to the event in which *all* the $n(t)$ users play no, therefore, due to Assumption 1, user i will remain in the game.

But, by Lemma 4, since at any SSPE, for any history of the game, $p_t(h^t) \in (0, 1)$, therefore, user $i, i \in N(t)$, must be indifferent between choosing yes and no. That is, (10) should be equal to (12), i.e.,

---

[1] Notice that another way to write (10) is as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] &= (V - g(t) - c_{yes})(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{n(t)-1} \binom{n(t)-1}{k} p_t(h^t)^k (1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-k} \left[\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t+1)] - c_{yes}\right] \quad (11)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}] \\
-c_{yes} + (V - g(t))(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1} + \Upsilon_{t+1} &= (1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] \\
&= (1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1})(1 - p_t(h^{t+1}))^{n(t)-1}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+2}, n(t)] \\
&= \cdots = \left[\prod_{r=0}^{s-1}(1 - p_t(h^{t+r}))^{n(t)-1}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+s}, n(t)] \\
&= \cdots = \lim_{s\to\infty}\left[\prod_{r=0}^{s-1}(1 - p_t(h^{t+r}))^{n(t)-1}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+s}, n(t)] \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} 0, \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Upsilon_{t+1} := \sum_{k=1}^{n(t)-1}\binom{n(t)-1}{k}p_t(h^t)^k(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-k}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t)],$$

and, (a) is correct since $\lim_{s\to\infty}\left[\prod_{r=0}^{s-1}(1 - (1 - p_t(h^{t+r}))^{n-1}))\right] = 0$.

Equation (13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)] &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] = \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}] = 0 \\
&\Rightarrow \Upsilon_{t+1} = \sum_{k=1}^{n(t)-1}\binom{n(t)-1}{k}p_t(h^t)^k(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-k}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^{t+1}, n(t)] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}]$ is simplified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}] &= -c_{yes} + (V - g(t))(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1} + \Upsilon_{t+1} \\
&= -c_{yes} + (V - g(t))(1 - p_t(h^t))^{n(t)-1}. \qquad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (14) implies that

$$p_t(h^t) = 1 - \sqrt[n(t)-1]{\frac{c_{yes}}{V - g(t)}} = p_t(V, n(t), g(t), c_{yes}). \qquad (15)$$

Equation (15) also proves the SSPE is not only *Unique* but also it is *Markovian*.

■

Corollary 1. *As another consequence of* (13)*, at any subgame initiated after any history of the SSPE, the expected utility of each user is zero. A similar result also holds for the case with re-entry option.*

IV. GAME: SET UP *with* RE-ENTRY OPTION

In this section we analyze the game formulated in Section II with *re-entry* option for users who play no.

In the following theorem, similar to Section III, we prove the existence and uniqueness of a symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium (SSPE). We further fully characterize the SSPE and show it is Markov perfect as well.

Theorem 5 (The Second Main Theorem)**.** *For the game specified in Section II with* re-entry *option for users, there is a symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium (SSPE) which has the following desirable properties:*

- Uniqueness*, i.e., there is only one symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium.*
- Markov perfect*, i.e., users' strategies in each round t of the game depend only on the state of the game in round t.*
- *The SSPE is characterized as follows. In each round $t, t \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$, (after history h^t) of the game, each user $i, i \in N$,* purely *randomizes over $\{yes, no\}$ and chooses to play yes with the following probability*

$$p_t(V, g(t), c_{yes}) = 1 - \sqrt[n-1]{\frac{c_{yes}}{V - g(t)}}. \tag{16}$$

The proof of this theorem is, more or less, similar to the proof of Theorem 1. Thus, we only bring the sketch of the proof.

Sketch of the proof: For simpilicity in arguments, we assume that $n > 2$.
First, we present the following lemma which can be proved similar to Lemma 2.

Lemma 6. *In any subgame after h^t, the expected utility of each user $i, i \in N$, is upper-bounded by $\frac{V - g(t) - c_{yes}}{n}$.*

Now, due the rules of the game specified in Section II with the re-entry option for users, we have for any $i, i \in N$, and $t, t \in \{1, 2, ...\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] &= -c_y + (V - g(t))(1 - p(h^t))^{n-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} p(h^t)^k (1 - p(h^t))^{n-k} \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}] \\ \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}] &= \left(1 - \binom{n-1}{1} p(h^t)(1 - p(h^t))^{n-2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}] \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t]$, $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}]$ are defined, respectively, similar to $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)]$, $\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{yes\}], \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t, n(t)|\{no\}]$ (see Section III). Notice that in the game with re-entry option for all $t, t \in \{1, 2, , ...\}$, $n(t) = n$ (that is why $n(t)$ is omitted).

By similar argument we can show that Lemma 3 is also hold in the game with re-entry option. This implies that there exists an $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $t, t \in \{1, 2, ...\}$, $p(h^t) > \alpha$, i.e., $p(h^t) \in (0, 1]$.

Next, we show that $p(h^t) \neq 1$. It is clear that in any round t, if $p(h^t) = 1$ then, for any $i, i \in N$, we must have

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] \geq \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}]. \tag{18}$$

But, substituting $p(h^t) = 1$ in (17) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] &= -c_y + \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}], \\ \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}] &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}] \\ &\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] < \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}], \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which is in contradiction with (18). Hence, $p(h^t) \in (0, 1)$, which implies that in each round $t, t \in \{1, 2, ...\}$, of the game, each user $i, i \in N$, should be indifferent between choosing yes and no. Equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] = \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}]. \tag{20}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t] = \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] &= \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}] \\ &= \left(1 - \binom{n-1}{1} p(h^t)(1-p(h^t))^{n-2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{i,t+1}[h^{t+1}] \\ &= \left[\prod_{r=0}^{s} \left(1 - \binom{n-1}{1} p(h^{t+r})(1-p(h^{t+r}))^{n-2}\right)\right] \mathbb{E}_{i,t+s+1}[h^{t+s+1}] \\ &= \lim_{s\to\infty} \left[\prod_{r=0}^{s} \left(1 - \binom{n-1}{1} p(h^{t+k})(1-p(h^{t+r}))^{n-2}\right)\right] \mathbb{E}_{i,t+s+1}[h^{t+s+1}] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Since $\lim_{s\to\infty} \left[\prod_{i=r}^{s} \left(1 - \binom{n-1}{1} p(h^{t+k})(1-p(h^{t+r}))^{n-2}\right)\right] = 0$. Thus, Eq. (17) along with Eqs. (20) and (21) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{yes\}] = -c_y + (V - g(t))(1-p(h^t))^{n-1} = \mathbb{E}_{i,t}[h^t|\{no\}] = 0. \tag{22}$$

Therefore,

$$p_t(V, g(t), c_{yes}) = 1 - \sqrt[n-1]{\frac{c_{yes}}{V - g(t)}}. \tag{23}$$

■

V. REVENUE

In the following theorem, we derive that the expected revenue of the network's owner in the game *with re-entry*.

Theorem 7. *Consider the the game specified in Section IV (the game* with *re-entry option). Then*

- *(Part 1): The expected revenue of the network's owner is*

$$REV = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{t-1} \left[1 - \frac{np_k(1-p_k)^{n-1}}{1-(1-p_k)^{n-1}}\right] \left(c_{yes} \frac{np_t}{1-(1-p_t)^{n-1}}\right)\right] \tag{24}$$

  where $p_k = 1 - \sqrt[n-1]{\frac{c_{yes}}{V-g(k)}}$.

- *(Part 2): Assuming* $g(t) = 0$*, for any* $t, t \in \{1, 2, ...\}$*, i.e.,* the value of wining the channel does not go down as time goes on, *implies:*

$$REV = V. \tag{25}$$

Proof: (*Proof of Part 1:*) To prove this part we characterize each term of Eq. (24) as follows.
The probability that the game ends in round t, given that round t is reached, is equal to

$$\frac{np_t(1-p_t)^{n-1}}{1-(1-p_t)^{n-1}}. \tag{26}$$

Thus the probability that the game did not end before round t is

$$\prod_{k=1}^{t-1}\left[1-\frac{np_k(1-p_k)^{n-1}}{1-(1-p_k)^{n-1}}\right]. \tag{27}$$

The expected number of users in round t of the game who play yes is

$$\frac{\sum_{r=1}^{n} r\binom{n}{r}p_t^r(1-p_t)^{n-r}}{\text{Prob(at least one user plays } yes\text{)}} = \frac{np_t}{1-(1-p_t)^{n-1}}. \tag{28}$$

Equations (26)-(28) complete the proof of Part 1.
(*Proof of Part 2*): Setting $g(t)=0$, implies that p_t becomes independent of t, i.e.,

$$p_t = 1-\sqrt[n-1]{\frac{c_{yes}}{V}} =: p. \tag{29}$$

Now, substituting (29) in (24) gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{REV}\Big|_{g(t)=0} &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\left[\left(c_{yes}\frac{np}{1-(1-p)^{n-1}}\right)\prod_{k=1}^{t-1}\left[1-\frac{np(1-p)^{n-1}}{1-(1-p)^{n-1}}\right]\right] \\
&= \left(c_{yes}\frac{np}{1-(1-p)^{n-1}}\right)\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\left[1-\frac{np(1-p)^{n-1}}{1-(1-p)^{n-1}}\right]^{t-1} \\
&= \left(c_{yes}\frac{np}{1-(1-p)^{n-1}}\right)\frac{1-(1-p)^{n-1}}{np(1-p)^{n-1}} \\
&= V.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

■

In the following theorem we derive the revenue of the network's owner for the game without re-entry option when $g(t) = 0$ for all t.

Theorem 8. *The revenue of the network's owner for the game specified in Section II (the game without re-entry option) when $g(t) = 0$, for all t, is equl to V.*

Proof: When $g(t)$, for all t, is zero, p_t (see (1)) becomes stationary, i.e., independent of t. Further, due to corollary 1, the expected utility of each user at any subgame of the SSPE is zero. Now, consider the whole game (which is itself a subgame). Each user wins the channel with probability $\frac{1}{n}$ (due to the symmetry). Thus its expected value in the subgame is $\frac{V}{n}$. But, since the expected utility of each user is zero, then the expected payment of each user is also $\frac{V}{n}$. Therefore, the expected revenue of the network's owner is equal to $n \times \frac{V}{n} = V$. ■

Remark 2. *Notice that in the proposed game* with and without re-entry option*, when, for all t, $g(t)$ is zero, i.e., the value of wining the channel for a user does not change as time goes on, then the revenue of the network's owner*

- *is independent of the number of users.*
- *is equal to V.*

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we proposed a new revenue maximizing dynamic game for allocating resources (e.g. channel) to strategic users. We characterized that for the proposed game (with and without re-entry option) there exists a symmetric subgame perfect equilibrium, which is not only unique but also Markov perfect. We characterize the revenue of the network's owner for the proposed game. Further, we showed that when the value of wining the channel is always fixed and equal to V, i.e., the value of wining the channel does not decrease as time goes on, then independent of the number of users the revenue of the network's owner is maximized and it is equal to V in both cases with and without re-entry option.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Kelly, "On tariffs, policing and admission control for multiservice networks," *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 15, pp. 1–9, 1994.

[2] R. Johari and J. Tsitsiklis, “Efficiency loss in a network resource allocation game,” *Mathematics of operation research*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 407–435, 2004.

[3] A. Lazar and N. Semret, “The progressive second price auction mechanism for network resource sharing,” *Proc. Int. Symp. on Dynamic Games and Applications*, 1997.

[4] R. Maheswaren and T. Basar, “Nash equilibrium and decenteralized negotiation in auctioning divisible resources,” *J. Group Decision and Negotiation*, 2003.

[5] S. Yang and B. Hajek, “Vcg-kelly mechanisms for allocation of divisible goods: Adapting vcg mechanisms to one-dimensional signals,” *IEEE. J. Selected Areas of Communications*, pp. 1237–1243, 2007.

[6] R. Jain and J. Walrand, “An efficient nash-implementation mechanism for divisible resource allocation,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 1276–1283.

[7] A. Kakhbod and D. Teneketzis, “An efficient game form for unicast service provisioning,” *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, To appear.

[8] ——, “Power allocation and spectrum sharing in cognitive radio networks with strategic users,” *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 1088–1095, 2010.

[9] T. Stoenescu and D. Teneketzis, “Decentralized resource allocation mechanisms in networks: Realization and implementation,” *Advances in Control, Communication Networks, and Transportation Systems, in Honor of Pravin Varaiya*, pp. 225–266, 2005.

[10] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole, *Game Theory*. MIT Press, 1991.

[11] J. M. Smith, “Theory of games and the evolution of animal contests,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, vol. 47, pp. 209–221, 1974.